DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 817 UD 013 019

AUTHOR	Saral, Tulsi B.
TITLE	A Content Analytic Study of Interracial Conflict-Producing Situations and Roles. Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged Series, Technical Report Number 9.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Psychology.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISED-TR-9
PUB DATE	Jul 71
NOTE	84p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Content Analysis; Cultural Environment; Economically Disadvantaged; *Interaction Process Analysis; Interpersonal Relationship; *Negro Literature; Periodicals; *Race Relations; Research Methodology; Role Conflict; *Role Perception; Role Theory; Short Stories; Social Environment; Social Relations

ABSTRACT

This study is an exploratory attempt to discover how blacks perceive their interactions with whites, in this country. For this purpose it was necessary to examine materials written by black authors and aimed at black readers. It was decided to select such magazines appearing between 1965 and 1969 that had a wide circulation among black readership. The study was restricted to 36 short stories which contained some interactions between black and white characters. Each interaction was viewed as involving an initiator (Actor) and an object (Recipient) toward whom the interaction was directed. The Actor and Recipient together constituted a role-pair. The results indicate that blacks perceived whites initiating the interactions more in general than the blacks. However further analysis revealed that the blacks were seen as initiating more interactions when they were in the role-pairs of female-male, employee-employer, person helped-helping profession, citizen-police official, citizen-public official, and female-female; whereas whites initiate more interactions when they are in the role-pairs of male-female, employer-employee, helping profession-person helped, police official-citizen, public official-citizen, teacher-student, and male-male. (Author/JM)

ED 069817

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS 61820

Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged

A CONTENT ANALYTIC STUDY OF INTERRACIAL CONFLICT-PRODUCING SITUATIONS AND ROLES

Tulsi B. Saral

University of Illinois

Technical Report No. 9

July, 1971

This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant No. 12-P-55175/5 from the Social and Rehabilitation Service Department of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D. C., 20201

Harry C. Triandis
Principal Investigator

UD 013019

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Preface

This report is part of a series concerned with the economically disadvantaged. We are testing the assumption that economic disadvantages create characteristic ways of perceiving and thinking about the social environment. We call such characteristic perceptions the "subjective culture" of a particular group. In earlier reports we showed substantial differences in the subjective cultures of blacks and whites who differ in level of economic advantage. We suspect that such differences in subjective culture lead to major barriers in communication between an employee and his supervisor, his fellow employees and his subordinates. We are currently working on training programs which will incorporate the information about such cultural differences and which can be used with both whites and blacks in industrial environments. The final step of the project will include validations of the effectiveness of such training.

The present report employs content analysis as the means of studying subjective culture. In some significant ways the results presented here are consistent with those of previous technical reports, suggesting that there is concurrent validity in our findings, since different methods give some similar results. In a later report we will review all the results of these reports to show explicitly the points of agreement.

Harry C. Triandis

A CONTENT ANALYTIC STUDY OF INTERRACIAL CONFLICT-PRODUCING SITUATIONS AND ROLES[1]

Tulsi B. Saral

University of Illinois

Human beings organize the sensory world by a process of categorization. Categorization simplifies man's task of responding to the environment by enabling him to make a similar response to different stimulus situations. The limiting factor is the individual's capacity to recognize common denominators or similarities among ranges of physical phenomena. This capacity to infer identity from cues or signs can be facilitated, developed or retarded by a variety of factors.

In the area of social perception, Triandis (1970) has hypothesized that economic disadvantages create characteristic ways of perceiving and thinking about the social environment. He calls such characteristic perceptions the "subjective culture" of a particular group.

Subjective culture involves perceptions of roles and behavior norms. Each of us, whether he likes it or not, must interact with many different persons. In the course of these interactions, we come to know things about the other persons with whom we interact. A host of impressions vie for our attention. The other persons we meet seem helpful, ambitious, friendly, hostile, cheerful, suspicious, angry, fearful and so forth. The impressions

---

[1]The research reported here was supported in part by the Social and Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Research Grant No. 12-P-55175/5 (Harry C. Triandis, Principal Investigator). I wish to thank Sharon Hall and Mark A. Fratti for their assistance in data collection and data analysis. I am grateful to Charles Osgood and Harry Triandis for their critical comments on an earlier version of this report.

we select or register the most, depend upon a variety of factors including our experiences in the past, our future expectations and our own intentions toward others. These judgments of others, the impressions we form of them, the ways in which we categorize them, and our effort to predict their likely behavior, have important implications for our behavior toward them.

Much of what we think we know about others stems directly from the ways in which we represent their behavior. In the words of Wallace (1971), each of us possesses an interpersonal "dictionary," set of terms, concepts, etc., which we use in making sense of the behavior of other persons. Our interpersonal "dictionaries" frequently limit what we see and what we do not see in interaction with others. According to Osgood (1969), most people most of the time create sentences that are congruent with their own systems of attitudes and beliefs. "The facets of reality that are sharpened or leveled by words depend on what properties have made a difference in the past" (Osgood, 1969). As a consequence, of course, we sometimes run into the danger of attending to features of events which are now irrelevant and of assuming certain qualities in others when they may not in fact exist.

"Cultures thus differ not only in the number of categories they utilize within a particular domain of meaning, but also in the number and the kinds of critical attributes they employ" (Triandis & Malpass, 1970). As a result, when people from two different cultures share the membership of the same organization, we would expect a number of phenomena relevant to social perception to influence their behavior and experience. Such differences in subjective cultures could lead to major barriers in communication between an employee and his supervisor, his fellow employees, and his subordinates.

The question of differences among blacks and whites in the U. S. A. has received considerable attention in recent years. However, the bulk of

the work by various social scientists has centered around the study of "black" culture (Clark, 1965; Keil, 1966; Liebow, 1967; Maruyama, 1969) and no systematic attempt seems to have been made to determine the extent of dissimilarity in values, norms, and roles among blacks and whites in our society. "We have little information about the extent of disagreement, the focus of disagreement, and the heterogeneity of responses within each of the two cultural groups, or within each of the domains of concepts. It is most likely that when enough research is done, we will find a very complex pattern of results, with various parts of each social group showing dissimilarities in particular values, norms, roles and particular facilities" (Triandis, 1970).

How do we come to know another culture? How do we determine the differences in subjective cultures of two groups? One approach would be to carry out empirical studies in the field to detect cultural differences in the two groups. Triandis and Malpass (1970) have proposed a theoretical framework to collect subjective culture data in a black-white culture setting. This framework includes a number of linguistic tasks and procedures which will reveal differences among the two cultures in their categorization and in their association of categories with certain other categories, as well as with affect and behavioral intentions.

Another approach to understand subjective culture would be by inference from literary sources of given cultures. The use of literary sources as spokesmen for their culture is not new in psychology and has been used profitably by a number of investigators. "If one wants to get a natural, unfractionated picture of behavior, this is one of the few sources available" (Barker & Wright, 1954). The most intensive use of written material for analyzing cultural aspirations across nations was made by McClelland (1961). Starting with the assumption that such things as the myths, folk

tales, and educational materials of a nation are representative of its collective concerns, he successfully employed the contents of school readers used in various countries as a measure of achievement motivation of the given countries.

The study of subjective culture involves, among other things, a study of perceptions of roles and behavior norms. Working in the area of interpersonal behavior, Katz (1964) developed a method of content analysis which would extract critical interactions from short stories and, based on the frequency distribution of both the role-pairs and the behaviors relating them, would reveal the culture-common and culture-specific patterns of interpersonal behavior. Short stories were selected for the purpose of analysis because "they would provide a reasonable source of interaction behaviors since they have a context which gives a highly intensive view of role-relations and are thus well adapted to obtaining feelings associated with verbal and non-verbal behaviors which might be difficult to get using other means, e.g., eliciting normative information from subjects, because of the bias associated with socially desirable behaviors" (Katz, 1964).

One limitation of Katz's approach is that it yields a very large number of interaction categories. The purpose is to obtain normative data according to role-pairs which makes it essential to have categories broken into very small units. In the content analysis of American short stories, for example, Katz (1964b) came up with 56 intention categories and 84 role pairs. Not only does this procedure necessitate a large number of categories in order to classify all of the behaviors encountered, it could also yield a different set of categories for different cultures, rendering comparisons between different cultures rather difficult.

Stimuli vary along dimensions, some of which are simple and obvious, like the dimensions of size or color, and some of which are exceedingly complex. The complex dimensions can often be analyzed into a set of simpler underlying dimensions or features. Working with interpersonal verbs, Osgood (1970b) has presented a model in which dimensions are hypothesized to operate as a simultaneous bundle of distinctive semantic features mediating the meaning of behavioral events, either perceived or intended.

Osgood suggests that the reduction of the complexities of interpersonal behaviors to sets of mediating intentions, and these in turn to a limited set of componential semantic features, would enliven the possibility of discovering universals. "The most likely constant in this domain would seem to be the dimensional feature structure of the intentions themselves. Thus we might expect all human groups to distinguish between Associative and Dissociative intentions (Helping vs. Hindering), between Supraordinate and Subordinate intentions (Dominating vs. Submitting), and so forth--simply because they are human" (Osgood, 1970a).

Osgood assumes that "in any language the words used to talk about interpersonal behaviors will be coded on the same semantic features as the perceived behaviors themselves. Thus, the interpersonal verb To Console as a linguistic sign will evoke in a listener a pattern of semantic features similar to that which the perceptual sign in the observer produces (e.g., seeing a mother stroking the face of a frightened child). This assumption--if justified--provides an entrèe to the structure of interpersonal behavior in a culture" (Osgood, 1970a).

It is suggested that a relatively small set of distinctive features can discriminate among a large number of affective intentions, expressed through interpersonal interactions. The mediation processes in interpersonal

perception serve to render many diverse overt expressions functionally equivalent. The use of appropriate semantic features to describe these expressions would facilitate the understanding of the underlying dimensions. Working with subjects from Illinois, Hawaii and Japan, Osgood and his associates have further demonstrated the applicability of such features across diverse cultures by showing that it is possible to infer the "cultural features" of role-pairs from the shared semantic features of interpersonal verbs that are considered appropriate or inappropriate in association with them in various cultures (Osgood, 1970a).

Objective of the Study

This study is an exploratory attempt to discover how blacks in the U.S.A. perceive their interactions with whites in this country. For this purpose it was necessary to examine materials written by black authors and aimed at black readers. It was, therefore, decided to select such magazines that had a wide circulation among black readership. The study was further restricted to short stories appearing in these magazines on the assumption that authors reflect, in their stories, sharpened perception of people in interaction and may be regarded as spokesmen for their culture. It was further assumed that the short stories written by members of one group, and depicting interactions between the members of two different groups would provide a reasonably useful source of interaction behaviors since they have a context which gives a highly intensive view of role relations. The selection of stories was, therefore, further restricted to only those stories which contained some interactions between black and white characters.

Selection of Magazines

The question of black/white relations have gained extra salience in the course of the last five or six years. The selection of magazines for the purposes of examination was therefore restricted to those published from 1965 to the summer of 1969.

On going through the periodical section of the University of Illinois Library, a list of magazines with a distinctive black readership was compiled for the purpose of preliminary analysis. Most of these magazines, however, were found to contain news commentaries like those in Time and Newsweek or light reading like Life and Look. Only four periodicals were found containing fiction in their reading material. These were: Tan, Negro Digest, Jive and Hep.

As was explained above, we were interested in only those stories which contained interaction between blacks and whites. Of the above four magazines, Hep did not contain any stories showing any black/white interaction. One issue of Jive contained a story featuring a black-white couple. Out of one hundred stories reviewed in Tan, only four showed interactions between blacks and whites. The only periodical which consistently contained fiction showing interaction between blacks and whites was the Negro Digest. A total of 32 such stories were found in this magazine, which brought the total of stories used to 36. A list of stories used with the source of publication is in Appendix A.

Identifying Instances of Interaction

Interpersonal interaction is defined, in this study, as any situation in which two persons are depicted as having been involved in any form of overt behavior. Each such interaction involves an Actor (agent) who initiates the interaction, and a Recipient (object) toward whom the interaction is directed. The Actor and the Recipient together constitute a Role-Pair. An interaction between a Role-Pair (Actor and Recipient) is indicated by occurance of an Interpersonal Verb. The Interaction Unit thus is a statement which contains a reference to behavior or intention of person A towards person B, either of whom could be an Actor or a Recipient. The focus is

an interpersonal behavior and intention and statements in which a behavior or intention is not originated by or directed towards a person are excluded from the analysis.

Identifying Role Pairs

Actor and Recipient of an Interaction Unit were assigned to appropriate Role-Pairs. Because of the special nature of the material under analysis (stories depicting black/white interactions only), most of the traditional role-pairs (like father-son, mother-daughter, husband-wife) involving reciprocal role-members were conspicuous by their absence, or by extremely low frequencies. Table 1 shows the list of role pairs elicited from the selected interactions.

This gave us 60 role-pairs. For the sake of organization and efficiency of analysis, these role-pairs were collapsed into broader categories. These categories with their component role-pairs are given in Table 2. Table 3 gives the distribution of interactions by these broader categories of role-pairs.

As will be seen from Table 3, out of a total of 1193 interactions, 44% (519) are initiated by blacks and directed towards whites, while 56% (674) are initiated by whites and directed towards blacks. However, within various role-pair categories, this distribution varies considerably. The role-pairs for which the percentage of black-white interactions are higher than the mean are: Female-Male; Employee-Employer; Person helped-Helping profession; Citizen-Police official; Citizen-Public Official; and Female-Female. On the other hand, the percentage of white-black interactions exceeds the mean for the following role-pairs: Male-Female; Employer-Employee; Helping profession-Person helped; Police official-Citizen; Public official-Citizen; Teacher-Student; and Male-Male.

Table 1

List of Role Pairs Elicited from the Selected Interactions

Man-Woman	Citizen-Policeman
Woman-Man	Policeman-Citizen
Child-Adult	Criminal-Victim
Adult-Child	Passenger-Passenger
Man-Man	Welfare Worker-Advisee
Client-Nurse	Advisee-Welfare Worker
Nurse-Client	Student Guardian-School Principal
Employer-Employee	School Principal-Student Guardian
Employee-Employer	School Board Member-Student Guardian
Boy-Boy	Policeman-Policy Worker
Woman-Woman	Policy Worker-Policeman
Applicant-Interviewer	Hitchiker-Driver
Interviewer-Applicant	Driver-Hitchiker
Soldier-Soldier	Man-Teenage Girl
Child-Child	Teenage Girl-Man
Policeman-College Student	Student-Student
College Student-Policeman	Teacher-Student
Waitress-Customer	Student-Teacher
Customer-Waitress	Girlfriend-Boyfriend
Tourist-Resort Worker	Boyfriend-Girlfriend
Resort Worker-Tourist	KKK Leader-Negro Doctor
Engaged Man-Engaged Woman	Patient-Doctor
Engaged Woman-Engaged Man	Customer-Store Clerk
Father-Father (of arguing sons)	Store Clerk-Customer
Bartender-Customer	Dead Child's Father-Grave Digger
Resident-Sheriff	KKK Member-Negroes
Sheriff-Resident	Governor-Resident

Table 2

Revised Categories of Role Pairs with their Components

Male-Female

1. Man-woman
2. Engaged man-engaged woman
3. Man-teenage girl
4. Boyfriend-girlfriend

Female-Male

1. Woman-man
2. Engaged woman-engaged man
3. Teenage girl-man
4. Girlfriend-boyfriend

Employer-Employee

1. Employer-employee
2. Interviewer-applicant

Employee-Employer

1. Employee-employer
2. Applicant-interviewer

Helping Profession-Person Helped

1. Nurse-client
2. Waitress-customer
3. Resort worker-tourist
4. Bartender-customer
5. Welfare worker-advisee
6. Store clerk-customer

Person Helped-Helping Profession

1. Client-nurse
2. Customer-waitress
3. Tourist-resort worker
4. Advisee-welfare worker
5. Patient-doctor
6. Customer-store clerk

Police Official-Citizen

1. Policeman-college student
2. Sheriff-resident
3. Policeman-citizen
4. Policeman-policy worker

Citizen-Police Official

1. Resident-sheriff
2. Citizen-policeman
3. Policy worker-policeman

Public Official-Citizen

1. School principal-guardian
2. Governor-resident

Citizen-Public Official

1. Guardian-school principal

Teacher-Student

1. Teacher-student
2. Adult-child

Student-Teacher

1. Student-teacher
2. Child-adult

Male-Male

1. Man-man
2. Child-child
3. Soldier-soldier
4. Father-father (or arguing sons)
5. Passenger-passenger
6. Student-student
7. Hitchiker-driver
8. Driver-hitchiker
9. KKK leader-Negro doctor
10. Dead child's father-grave digger
11. KKK member-Negroes

Female-Female

1. Woman-woman

Miscellaneous*

*Role pairs having frequency of two and less grouped together.

Table 3

Distribution of Interactions by Broad Role Pair Categories

Role Pair Category	Black-White	White-Black	Total
Male-Female	38	124	162
Female-Male	135	45	180
Employer-Employee	0	56	56
Employee-Employer	57	1	58
Helping Profession-Person Helped	3	72	75
Person Helped-Helping Profession	80	32	112
Police Official-Citizen	0	94	94
Citizen-Police Official	38	9	47
Public Official-Citizen	0	6	6
Citizen-Public Official	9	0	9
Teacher-Student	7	37	44
Student-Teacher	11	11	22
Male-Male	98	129	227
Female-Female	28	19	47
Miscellaneous	15	39	54
	519	674	1193

Of special significance is the observation that in the black-white interactions, not a single instance was found for the role pairs Employer-Employee, Police Official-Citizen, Public Official-Citizen, and only three instances (out of a total of 75) for the role-pair Helping Profession-Person Helped. Under the white-black interactions, on the other hand, no instance was found for the role-pair Citizen-Public Official, and only one instance (out of a total of 58) for the role-pair Employee-Employer.

Assigning Interactions to Interpersonal Verb Categories

Once the Actor and the Recipient of the interaction were identified, the actual verb clause indicating or referring to the interaction was recorded. A comprehensive interpersonal verb category list along the lines of "Categories for Organization of Intentions" (Katz, 1964b) was compiled to serve as a guide for assigning these interactions to appropriate categories. This preliminary category list is in Appendix B. Later for the sake of better organization and efficiency, these categories were collapsed under 17 super-categories (Table 4). Table 5 gives the distribution of interactions by these revised interpersonal verb categories.

A chi-square test was carried out between the interactions between blacks and whites and those between whites and blacks on all 17 interpersonal verb categories and the results yielded statistically significant differences (chi square of 158.92 with 16 degrees of freedom).

Direction of Differences

To determine the direction of differences, an interaction ratio was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Interaction Ratio} = \frac{\text{No. of W-B Interactions} - \text{No. of B-W Interactions}}{\text{No. of W-B Interactions} + \text{No. of B-W Interactions}}$$

Table 4

Revised Interpersonal Verb Categories

I. To Show Interest In

1.1 pays attention to
1.2 is responsive to
1.3 encourages
1.4 confides in
1.5 confesses to
1.6 gives opinion to
1.7 expresses feeling to
1.8 chatters to
1.9 greets
1.10 calls to
1.11 imitates
1.12 identifies with
1.13 shares interests
1.14 exchange things
1.15 shares affection for same object
1.16 share concerns, problems
1.17 admires possessions
1.18 admires human qualities
1.19 admires appearance
1.20 to admire talent

II. To Show Affection For

2.1 behaves affectionately to
2.2 speaks affectionately to
2.3 shows appreciation to
2.4 is friendly to
2.5 feel affection for
2.6 does things for (goes places with)
2.7 plays with
2.8 socializes with
2.9 gets alone with
2.10 gives invitation to (or accepts)
2.11 kids with
2.12 teases (playfully)

III. To Show Consideration for

3.1 does things for, serves
3.2 protects
3.3 waits on
3.4 serves food or drinks
3.5 buys clothing
3.6 is patient with
3.7 is forgiving to
3.8 is sympathetic to
3.9 is solicitous to

Table 4 (Continued)

III (Continued)

3.10 is considerate of
3.11 is thoughtful of
3.12 feels compassion for
3.13 to worry about (positive sense)
3.14 reassures
3.15 comforts
3.16 does not punish for wrongdoing
3.17 not wanting to hurt

IV. To Cooperate

4.1 cooperates with
4.2 accepts as equal
4.3 says thank you
4.4 expresses appreciation for
4.5 wishes to thank

V. To Please/Support

5.1 gives presents to
5.2 promises things to
5.3 compliments, flatters
5.4 praises, rewards
5.5 gives approval to
5.6 reassures
5.7 gives support to
5.8 defends
5.9 saves from danger
5.10 does extra work for

VI. To Influence/Control

6.1 makes suggestion to
6.2 gives advice to
6.3 requests
6.4 gives instructions, directions
6.5 teaches
6.6 gives information to or explains to
6.7 stimulates the interest of
6.8 urges (pleads with)
6.9 commands (gives orders to)
6.10 dominates
6.11 persuades
6.12 punishes
6.13 scolds, reprimands, admonishes
6.14 is strict with

Table 4 (Continued)

VI. (Continued)

6.15 handcuffs
6.16 holds physically
6.17 arrests
6.18 disapproves maintaining a relationship with person of opposite sex
6.19 advises against maintaining a relationship with person of opposite sex
6.20 physically prevents entering a relationship with a person of opposite sex

VII. To Assert Superiority

7.1 boasts to
7.2 boasts of material possession
7.3 acts superior to
7.4 considers oneself superior to
7.5 hires
7.6 retains as employee
7.7 is proud of own performance
7.8 shows financial generosity
7.9 provides medical care
7.10 provides employment
7.11 displays social acceptance
7.12 displays patronizing empathy
7.13 expects social subordination
7.14 expects administrative subordination
7.15 expects educational subservience
7.16 admires social subordination
7.17 admires political subordination
7.18 is vain in regard to personal relationship

VIII. To Hurt or Be Hostile To

8.1 behaves aggressively to
8.2 is hostile to
8.3 speaks angrily to
8.4 shocks
8.5 threatens, bullies
8.6 embarasses
8.7 humiliates
8.8 argues with
8.9 disagrees with
8.10 has fun at the expense of R
8.11 beats with an instrument
8.12 causes physical injury to
8.13 tortures
8.14 kills

Table 4 (Continued)

VIII. (Continued)

8.15 is angry at
8.16 would like to hurt
8.17 plans to kill
8.18 suppresses
8.19 wants to argue with
8.20 experiences sadistic pleasure in injuring
8.21 experiences sadistic pleasure in beating
8.22 experiences sadistic pleasure in teasing maliciously
8.23 seeks collective destruction

IX. To Discriminate

9.1 ridicules (makes fun of, mocks)
9.2 is sarcastic to
9.3 is disdainful to
9.4 criticizes
9.5 considers nonsignificant
9.6 accuses of low moral standards
9.7 is rude to
9.8 insults
9.9 swears at
9.10 feels bitterly toward
9.11 hates
9.12 does not like
9.13 considers phony
9.14 considers cowardly
9.15 considers educationally backward
9.16 sees P as hypocrit
9.17 perceives as physically repulsive
9.18 sees as burden
9.19 finds amusing (negative)
9.20 views as awkward, unappealing
9.21 gives slow service
9.22 cheats
9.23 denies educational status
9.24 denies economic status
9.25 denies professional status
9.26 denies administrative status
9.27 denies social status
9.28 exercises social discrimination
9.29 discriminates in use of public facilities
9.30 denies of police protection
9.31 disapproves moving into neighborhood
9.32 advises against moving into neighborhood
9.33 physically prevents moving into neighborhood

Table 4 (Continued)

X. To Distantiate

10.1 is unaccepting of
10.2 accuses, confronts
10.3 doubts, acts suspicious to
10.4 does not empathize
10.5 is impatient with
10.6 ignores
10.7 is unresponsive to
10.8 is reserved toward
10.9 hides feelings from
10.10 deceives, lies to
10.11 is evasive to
10.12 refuses help, present, comfort, affection from
10.13 is defensive to (makes excuses)
10.14 has superficial contact with
10.15 has noncommittal relationship
10.16 withdraws from
10.17 avoids
10.18 gets rid of, dismiss
10.19 quits employment of
10.20 quits dating
10.21 is thoughtless of
10.22 is inconsiderate of
10.23 is selfish toward
10.24 has resentment for
10.25 does things without, excludes
10.26 does not socialize with, refuse invitation from
10.27 does not recognize (familiarity)

XI. To Behave Subordinately

11.1 is influenced by
11.2 obeys command or request of
11.3 submits to (gives in to, is dominated by)
11.4 asks for favor from
11.5 asks for information, explanation from
11.6 asks for help, pleads for
11.7 seeks protection, reassurance, comfort, affection from
11.8 asks for help, direction, advice from
11.9 waits for, follows, stands beside
11.10 gives response expected by R
11.11 proves ability to pay before requesting service
11.12 feigning ignorance
11.13 does thing one does not consider self-respecting
11.14 submits sexually without feeling responsive

Table 4 (Continued)

XII. To Feel Humiliated

12.1 is self-effacing to
12.2 feels inadequate with respect to
12.3 is embarrassed
12.4 feel guilty
12.5 to feel need to explain
12.6 to apologize
12.7 to regret
12.8 to see others finding fault with A
12.9 to see others accusing A
12.10 to see others setting traps
12.11 to see others as ridiculing A
12.12 to see others as pretending to be affectionate
12.13 to see R as suppressing him
12.14 to be frightened of
12.15 to be embarrassed
12.16 to be uncomfortable
12.17 is shocked by
12.18 feels threatened by
12.19 feels humiliated by
12.20 is disappointed by
12.21 feels defeated

XIII. Not to Conform

13.1 rebels against, is insolent, defiant to
13.2 protests to, contradicts
13.3 does not take advice, suggestion of
13.4 refuses to obey command or request of
13.5 is not dominated by
13.6 is not threatened by
13.7 does not identify with

XIV. To be Resentful

14.1 envies opportunity
14.2 envies social achievement
14.3 seeks failure of recipient
14.4 envies affection
14.5 resents economic achievement
14.6 complains
14.7 states grievance
14.8 disapproves

Table 4 (Continued)

XV. To Avoid Unpleasantness

15.1 is polite to
15.2 agrees with
15.3 refuses to argue with
15.4 avoids discussing racial differences
15.5 keeps cool in face of provocation
15.6 keeps cool in face of disappointment
15.7 protects oneself with being reserve

XVI. To Defend Oneself

16.1 asserts equality
16.2 accuses of lack of compassion
16.3 accuses of job discrimination
16.4 accuses of seeing physical repulsion
16.5 accuses of segregation of recreation facilities
16.6 accuses of loan facilities discrimination
16.7 accuses of denying facilities
16.8 accuses of overall discrimination
16.9 claims innocence
16.10 physically fights off

XVII. Pursue Members of Opposite Sex

17.1 courts
17.2 proposes marriage (accepts)
17.3 goes steady with
17.4 false flattery
17.5 seeks to possess
17.6 makes advances
17.7 commands to submit sexually
17.8 assaults
17.9 offer drinks to minor
17.10 speaks lewdly to
17.11 attempt to persuade to promiscuity

Table 5

Distribution of Interactions by Revised

Interpersonal Verb Categories

IPV Super Categories		Black-White	White-Black
1.	To Show Interest In	21	20
2.	To Show Affection For	15	23
3.	To Show Concern For	41	31
4.	To Cooperate	3	5
5.	To Please/Support	7	35
6.	To Influence/Control	12	26
7.	To Assert Superiority	3	8
8.	To Hurt/Be Hostile To	55	119
9.	To Discriminate	57	162
10.	To Distantiate	51	62
11.	To Behave Subordinately	58	27
12.	To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	81	59
13.	Not to Conform	40	10
14.	To Be Resentful	5	15
15.	To Avoid Unpleasantness	28	6
16.	To Defend Oneself	22	3
17.	To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	20	63

These interaction ratios for each of the seventeen categories are given in Table 6. The mean interaction over all the categories is .13. Table 7 attempts to show separately those interpersonal verb categories in which the white-to-black interaction ratio is higher than the mean interaction ratio and also those in which black-to-white interaction exceeds the mean interaction ratio.

As will be seen from Table 7, the three categories for which white-black interactions exceed the mean maximally are: (1) to please/support, (2) to pursue members of the opposite sex and (3) to be resentful. Whereas, the three categories for which black-white interactions exceed the mean maximally are: (1) to defend oneself; (2) to avoid unpleasantness and (3) not to conform.

The distribution of interactions by IP verb categories for each role-pair is in Appendix C. It was not considered useful to calculate interaction ratios for the distribution of IPV categories under each of the role pairs because of the low frequencies on most of the IPV categories.

Coding Interactions on Semantic Features

A reference was made earlier to Osgood's attempts to reduce the complexities of interpersonal behavior to sets of mediating intentions, and these in turn to a limited set of componential semantic features. It was suggested that a relatively small set of distinctive features can discriminate among a large number of affective intentions, expressed through interpersonal interactions and that the use of appropriate semantic features can facilitate the understanding of the underlying dimensions of interpersonal perceptions and interactions.

Three graduate students in psycholinguistics at the University of Illinois were given a description of ten semantic features (Appendix D) used by Osgood

Table 6

Interaction Ratio* for 17 Interpersonal Verb Categories

IPV Categories		Interaction Ratio
1.	To Show Interest In	-.02
2.	To Show Affection For	.21
3.	To Show Concern For	-.13
4.	To Cooperate	.25
5.	To Please/Support	.66
6.	To Influence/Control	.36
7.	To Assert Superiority	.45
8.	To Hurt/Be Hostile To	.36
9.	To Discriminate	.47
10.	To Distantiate	.09
11.	To Behave Subordinately	-.36
12.	To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	-.15
13.	Not To Conform	-.60
14.	To Be Resentful	.50
15.	To Avoid Unpleasantness	-.64
16.	To Defend Oneself	-.76
17.	To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	.51

$$*\text{Interaction Ratio} = \frac{\text{No. of W-B Interactions} - \text{No. of B-W Interactions}}{\text{No. of W-B Interactions} + \text{No. of B-W Interactions}}$$

Table 7

The IPV Categories for Which Interaction Ratio is Higher than the Mean (.13)

A. Categories for which W-B Interaction Ratio is Higher than the Mean

IPV Categories	IR Ratio
To show affection for	.21
To cooperate	.25
To please/support	.66
To influence/control	.36
To assert superiority	.45
To hurt/be hostile to	.36
To discriminate	.47
To be resentful	.50
To pursue members of opposite sex	.51

B. Categories for which B-W Interaction Ratio is Higher than the Mean

To show interest in	-.02
To show consideration for	-.13
To distantiate	.09
To behave subordinately	-.36
To feel inadequate and persecuted	-.15
Not to conform	-.60
To avoid unpleasantness	-.64
To defend oneself	-.76

and associates to code interpersonal verbs (Osgood, 1966a; 1968). They were asked to rate each of the interpersonal verbs (Appendix B) occurring in the selected interaction statements on each of the following 10 semantic features. These interpersonal verbs were rated without any reference to Actor-Recepient role information. The rating of "1" indicated the left side of the feature ("moral" in the case of the feature "moral-immoral"), that of "3" the right side ("immoral" in the case of the above feature) and the rating of "2" indicated that the feature was either inapplicable to that particular verb or the verb could assume both the rating of "1" and "3" depending upon the situational context.

Moral/Immoral
Potent/Impotent
Active/Passive
Associative/Dissociative
Initiating/Reacting
Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented
Supraordinate/Subordinate
Terminal/Interminal
Future-oriented/Past-oriented
Deliberate/Impulsive

Table 8 gives the mean ratings on ten semantic features for B-W and W-B interactions. T-tests were carried out for the two groups (B-W interactions and W-B interactions) and differences between the two groups were found significant on all features.

As will be seen from this table, the interpersonal verbs used in describing white-black interactions are rated as more "moral" than black-white interactions, whereas those used in describing black-white interactions are rated more "potent" than the white-black interactions. On the Active/Passive feature both are rated on the "passive" side--W-B interactions being rated more passive than the B-W interactions. On the features Associative/Dissociative, Initiating/Reacting and Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented, both groups received the "Associative," "Initiating" and "Ego-oriented" ratings. However, W→B interactions are rated as more associative and alter-oriented than the

Table 8

T-Test Scores on B-W and W-B Interactions Rated on Ten Features

Features	Black-White (N = 519) $\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation	White-Black (N = 674) $\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation	Difference
Moral/Immoral	2.06[1]	.74	1.78	.84	.28**
Potent/Impotent	1.92	.73	2.15	.67	-.23**
Active/Passive	2.20	.80	2.53	.71	-.33**
Associative/Dissociative	1.85	.92	1.74	.91	.11*
Initiating/Reacting	1.56	.79	1.92	.87	-.36**
Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented	1.99	.91	1.57	.80	.42**
Supra-ordinate/Subordinate	1.88	.65	2.43	.64	-.55**
Terminal/Interminal	1.71	.84	2.00	.82	-.29**
Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	1.76	.73	1.87	.70	-.11**
Deliberate/Impulsive	2.05	.85	2.15	.86	-.10**

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

[1]The lower the value, the more the mean is toward the left-hand term.

B→W interactions while the black-to-white interactions are seen as more initiating than the white-to-black interactions. On the feature Supraordinate/Subordinate black-to-white interactions are seen as supraordinate (1.88) while white-to-black interactions receive ratings on the subordinate side (2.43). Black-white interactions are seen as "terminal" on the terminal/interminal feature whereas white-black interactions received a neutral rating (2.00) on the feature. On Future/Past-orientedness, both groups are rated as future-oriented in their interactions--black-white more so than the white-black. Both groups received ratings on the impulsive side, the white-black interactions being seen as more impulsive than the black-white interactions.

The mean ratings on semantic features for black-to-white and white-to-black interactions for each of the role-pair categories is in Appendix F.

Distribution of Features on Role-Dimensions

Analyzing Behavioral Role Differential data, Triandis et al. (1968) discovered the following four culture-common orthogonal components:

1. giving high affect versus not giving affect
2. ambivalent intimacy versus formality
3. supraordination versus subordination
4. ambivalent friendship versus loft avoidance

Oncken (1968) demonstrated that role-space is characterized by (1) an intimacy-affect dimension which consists of high intimacy on one end and low affect, formality and hostility on the other end; and (2) a second dimension of low-high versus high-low status.

It was decided to have all role pairs (Table 1) occurring in the data rated on two dimensions discovered both in Triandis (1968) and Oncken (1968) studies, namely, Intimacy and Status dimensions. The same three graduate students who rated the interpersonal verbs on semantic features, were asked to rate these role pairs on status and intimacy dimensions. On each role-pair the judges were to indicate for each actor whether his relationship to the

recipient was one of superior, equal, or subordinate status, in the form:

The employers' relationship to the employee is one of (superior) (equal) (subordinate) status;

and whether it was one of high, intermediate, or low intimacy, in this form:

The employers' relationship to the employee is one of (high) (intermediate) (low) intimacy.

A score of 1 was assigned to Superior/High, 2 to Equal/Intermediate and that of 3 to Subordinate/Low. The ratings for the three subjects were pooled and averaged, and the resultant mean scores were categorized as follows:

Mean score of 1 to 1.5	High
Mean score of 1.5 to 2.5	Neutral/Ambiguous
Mean score of 2.5 to 3	Low

Such a distribution of role-pairs on Status and Intimacy dimensions is given in Table 9.

As will be seen from this table, B-W interactions fall mostly under neutral status (280 out of 519) and low status (218 out of 519) interactions, where white-to-black interactions fall under neutral status (358 out of 674) and high status (245 out of 674) interactions. On the intimacy dimension, however, the distribution pattern for both black-to-white and white-to-black interactions is similar; both fall under neutral and low intimacy cells. Seen on both status and intimacy dimensions simultaneously, the bulk of black-to-white interactions are in neutral status-neutral intimacy (228 out of 519) and low status-low intimacy (177 out of 519) cells, whereas the bulk of white-black interactions are in neutral status-neutral intimacy (256 out of 674) and high status-low intimacy (203 out of 674) cells.

Table 9

Distribution of Role Pairs on Status and Intimacy Dimensions

		Intimacy							
		High		Neutral		Low		Total	
		B-W	W-B	B-W	B-W	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
Status	High	10	29	7	13	4	203	21	245
	Neutral	4	3	228	256	48	99	280	358
	Low	11	7	30	33	177	31	218	71
Total		25	39	265	302	229	333	519	674

The distribution of the semantic feature ratings on the Status and Intimacy dimensions of the role pairs is given in Tables 10 and 11. As will be seen from Table 10, the prominent differences (differences of .33 and higher) in black-white and white-black interactions are revealed on three features for the High Status category, on three features for the Neutral Status category, and on six features for the Low Status category. The features concerned for High Status are: Moral/Immoral (B-W 2.38 vs. W-B 1.66), Associative/Dissociative (B-W 2.12 vs. W-B 1.64) and Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.90 vs. W-B 2.48); for Neutral Status: Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented (B-W 1.92 vs. W-B 1.58), Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.97 vs. W-B 2.38), and Deliberate/Impulsive (B-W 2.07 vs. W-B 1.54); and for Low Status: Moral/Immoral (B-W 2.12 vs. W-B 1.66), Potent/Impotent (B-W 1.85 vs. W-B 2.29), Active/Passive (B-W 2.14 vs. W-B 2.55), Associative/Dissociative (B-W 1.84 vs. W-B 1.47), Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented (B-W 2.11 vs. W-B 1.63), and Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.73 vs. W-B 2.37).

On the Intimacy dimension (Table 11), differences (of .33 and higher) are found on three features for High Intimacy, on one feature for Neutral Intimacy, and on six features for Low Intimacy. The features on which differences occur for High Intimacy are: Moral/Immoral (B-W 2.44 vs. W-B 1.94), Active/Passive (B-W 2.52 vs. W-B 2.17), and Deliberate/Impulsive (B-W 2.20 vs. W-B 1.74); for Neutral Intimacy: Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.95 vs. W-B 2.33); and for Low Intimacy: Moral/Immoral (B-W 2.08 vs. W-B 1.65), Active/Passive (B-W 2.17 vs. W-B 2.65), Initiating/Reacting (B-W 1.41 vs. W-B 2.15), Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented (B-W 2.13 vs. W-B 1.47), Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.77 vs. W-B 2.53, and Terminal/Interminal (B-W 1.71 vs. W-B 2.15).

Table 10

Distribution of Semantic Feature Ratings on the Status Dimension of the Role-Pairs

Feature	High Status		Neutral Status		Low Status	
	B-W N=21	W-B N=245	B-W N=280	W-B N=358	B-W N=218	W-B N=71
Moral/Immoral	2.38	1.66	1.98	1.86	2.12	1.66 *
Potent/Impotent	1.98	2.09	1.94	2.13	1.85	2.29
Active/Passive	2.47	2.59	2.21	2.52	2.14	2.55
Associative/Dissociative	2.12	1.64	1.84	1.87	1.84	1.47
Initiating/Reacting	1.84	2.12	1.64	1.89	1.45	1.46
Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.70	1.58	1.92	1.58	2.11	1.63
Supraordinate/Subordinate	1.90	2.48	1.97	2.38	1.73	2.37
Terminal/Interminal	1.79	2.06	1.47	1.63	1.67	2.05
Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	2.08	1.84	1.83	1.86	1.62	1.88
Deliberate/Impulsive	2.35	2.33	2.07	1.54	1.92	1.81

*The underlining indicates a difference of .33 or higher between the B→W and W→B ratings.

Table 11

Distribution of Semantic Feature Ratings on the Intimacy Dimension of the Role Pairs

	High Intimacy		Neutral Intimacy		Low Intimacy	
	B-W N-25	W-B N=39	B-W N=265	W-B N=302	B-W N=229	W-B N=333
Feature						
Moral/Immoral	2.44	1.94	2.00	1.88	2.08	1.65*
Potent/Impotent	1.92	2.02	1.93	2.11	1.86	2.18
Active/Passive	2.52	2.17	2.19	2.44	2.17	2.65
Associative/Dissociative	2.20	2.09	1.83	1.88	1.83	1.59
Initiating/Reacting	1.88	1.66	1.61	1.71	1.41	2.15
Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.72	1.66	1.90	1.66	2.13	1.47
Supraordinate/Subordinate	1.88	2.12	1.95	2.33	1.77	2.53
Terminal/Interminal	1.72	1.69	1.70	1.84	1.71	2.15
Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	1.72	1.66	1.83	1.83	1.68	1.95
Deliberate/Impulsive	2.20	1.74	2.07	2.56	1.98	2.26

*Underlining indicates a difference of .33 or higher between the B→W and W→B ratings.

As is evidenced by the above description, the differences on most features are revealed for both low status and low intimacy role-pairs (six out of 10 features in each case) and on at least one feature for neutral status (2 features) and neutral intimacy (one feature). Only two features (Moral/Immoral and Supraordinate/Subordinate) discriminated across both status and intimacy dimensions of the role-pairs. The feature Moral/Immoral discriminates on both high and low continuums of both the Status and Intimacy dimensions. In all the four cells, white-black interactions are perceived more "moral" than black-white interactions. The feature Supraordinate/Subordinate discriminates across all the three levels (high, neutral and low) of the Status dimension and two levels (neutral and low) of the Intimacy dimension. In all the five cells, i.e., irrespective of the fact that interactants share high or low status, or high or low intimacy relationships, black-white interactions are consistently perceived as more supraordinate than white-black interactions. Under the low status interactions, white-black interactions are perceived more moral, less potent, more passive, more associative, more ego-oriented, and more subordinate than black-white interactions. Under the low intimacy interactions, white-black interactions are perceived as more moral, more passive, more reacting, more ego-oriented, more subordinate and more interminal than black-white interactions.

A further break-up of the feature ratings for black-white and white-black interactions under combined Status and Intimacy dimensions is in Appendix F. However, due to unusually low frequencies in many of the cells, no attempt is made to interpret those results here.

Conclusions

This study was an attempt to explore how black-white and white-black interactions were perceived by blacks in this country. The results indicate that as far as the initiation of interactions is concerned, blacks perceived whites initiating the interactions more than the blacks (W-B 674 vs. B-W 519). The break-up under role-pair categories, however, revealed that the blacks initiate more interactions when they are in the role-pairs of Female-male, Employee-employer, Person helped-helping profession, Citizen-police official, Citizen-public official and Female-female; whereas whites initiate more interactions when they are in the role-pairs of Male-female, Employer-employee, Helping profession-person helped, Police official-citizen, Public official-citizen, Teacher-student and Male-male. The results further show that (from black authors' perception), in their interactions with whites, blacks indulged more (than whites) in the following activities:

To show interest in
To show consideration for
To distantiate
To behave subordinately
To feel inadequate and persecuted
Not to conform
To avoid unpleasantness
To defend oneself;

whereas, whites are seen, in their interactions with blacks, to indulge more in the activities:

To show affection for
To cooperate
To please/support
To influence/control
To assert superiority
To hurt, be hostile to
To discriminate
To be resentful
To pursue members of opposite sex.

This view of the world as depicted by black writers in their stories reflects the dominance pattern prevaling in the society today. The whites, in their interactions with blacks, are shown as patronizing and pleasant when they elicit from blacks the kinds of behaviors they like (e.g., subordination) and as hostile and resentful when they elicit the behaviors they do not like (e.g., distantiation, defiance, etc.). The blacks, on the other hand, are shown as putting on a kind of mask of interest, pleasantness and, to a degree, seemingly subordination behind which they attempt to hide their true intent of maintaining their identity and not conforming to the standards of the white world.

When the results were analyzed on semantic features of interpersonal behavior, white-to-black interactions were perceived significantly higher (than black-white interactions) in the direction of the moral, associative, ego-oriented, future-oriented and deliberate ends of the relevant features; whereas, black-to-white interactions were seen significantly higher in the direction of the potent, active, initiating, supraordinate and terminal ends of the features concerned. The rating pattern on subordinate-supraordinate feature deserves special consideration. The interaction ratio (Table 6) showed that frequency of subordinate behaviors was much higher for B→W interactions than those for W→B interactions. However, the feature analysis shows B→W interactions higher on the superordination feature than W→B interactions. In other words, whereas whites, in their interactions with blacks, are seen as engaging in a larger number of slightly superordinate behaviors, blacks in their interactions with whites are shown engaging in behaviors which though low in frequency, rate very high on quality and intensity of superordination.

From the methodological point of view, the Katz approach did indeed yield an unusually large number of interpersonal verb (96) and role-pair (54) categories, which necessitated collapsing them, somewhat arbitarily, into broader "super categories." The application of semantic features for analyzing interpersonal interactions, on the other hand, proved more efficient in discriminating among a large number of interpersonal interactions between members of two cultures, and highlighted certain basic dimensions around which most differences among blacks and whites are clustered.

References

Barker, R. G., & Wright, H. F. Midwest and its children. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1954.

Clark, K. B. Dark ghetto: Dilemmas of social power. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Katz, E. W. A content analytic method for studying interpersonal behavior. ONR Technical Report No. 19. Urbana, Ill.: Department of Psychology and Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, 1964a.

Katz, E. W. A study of verbal and nonverbal behaviors associated with social roles. ONR Technical Report No. 20. Urbana, Ill.: Department of Psychology and Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, 1964b.

Keil, C. Urban blues. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago University Press, 1966.

Liebow, E. Tally's corner: A study of Negro street corner men. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

Maruyama, M. The ghetto logic, 1969. (Mimeo)

McClelland, D. C. The achieving society. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1961.

Osgood, C. E. Conservative words and radical sentences in the semantics of international politics. Urbana, Ill.: Center for Comparative Psycholinguistics, University of Illinois, 1969.

Osgood, C. E. Interpersonal verbs and interpersonal behavior. In J. Cohen (Ed.), Studies in thought and language. Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1970a.

Osgood, C. E. Speculation on the structure of interpersonal intentions. Behavioral Science, 1970b, 15, No. 3.

Triandis, H. C. Person perception: A review of the literature and implications. Report No. 3, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., & Malpass, R. S. Field guide for the study of aspects of subjective culture. Report No. 4, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., Vassiliou, V., & Nassiakou, M. Three cross-cultural studies of subjective culture. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement, 1968, 8, No. 4, 1-42.

Wallace, J. Psychology: A social science. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1971.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Stories Selected for Analysis

Title of Story	Source	Date	Author
1. The Top Hat Hotel	Negro Digest	June, 1969	
2. Not Your Singing, Dancing Spade	Negro Digest	February, 1967	Julia Fields
3. Health Service	Negro Digest	November, 1965	
4. Yes, We Can Sing	Negro Digest	December, 1965	
5. Karen's Spring	Negro Digest	January, 1966	Eloise Greenfield
6. Judah's a Two-Way Street Running Out	Negro Digest	January, 1966	Jack Burris
7. The Sign	Negro Digest	February, 1966	Sam Greenlee
8. Iced Tea	Negro Digest	March, 1966	Azrin Adams
9. United States Congressman	Negro Digest	March, 1966	Hamilton Bims
10. Ten Minutes at the Bus Stop	Negro Digest	January, 1965	Ruth Burke
11. Walker in the Dust	Negro Digest	February, 1965	Elizabeth Sweet
12. The Blackberry Pit	Negro Digest	March, 1965	Bobb Hamilton
13. The Satin-Back Crepe Dress	Negro Digest	March, 1965	
14. Jacob's Dilemma	Negro Digest	April, 1965	Louie Robinson
15. The Gift	Negro Digest	May, 1965	Benjamin Bluitt
16. The Rope on the Steps	Negro Digest	May, 1965	Anita Cronwell
17. James Washburn	Negro Digest	June, 1965	B. Charles Simmons
18. To the Fair	Negro Digest	July, 1965	H. R. Wolf
19. Incident on the Bus	Negro Digest	August, 1965	Dudley Randall
20. Both My Girls	Negro Digest	October, 1965	Jeff Deggs

Title of Story	Source	Date	Author
21. "On" The Charm of Harry Jones	Negro Digest	August, 1967	Norman de Joie
22. The Willie Bob Letters	Negro Digest	January, 1969	Fredde Welson
23. Moma	Negro Digest	February, 1969	Audrey Lee
24. There Is No Other Way	Negro Digest	May, 1967	Addison Gayle
25. Bright Morning Star	Negro Digest		
26. Support Your Local Police	Negro Digest	November, 1967	Ed Bullin
27. Ain't No Use in Crying	Negro Digest	December, 1967	Ann Aleen Shockley
28. Strong Horse Tea	Negro Digest	June, 1968	Alice Walker
29. The House Next Door	Tan	July, 1969	
30. The Living	Negro Digest	Sept/Oct, 1968	Paula Fox
31. And Save a Round for Jamie Brown	Negro Digest	April, 1966	Anita Cornwell
32. Bus No. 51	Negro Digest	May, 1966	Ben Bluitt
33. A Day's Living	Negro Digest	June, 1966	Dolores Armstead
34. From Two Worlds	Tan	April, 1969	
35. The Miracle Ahead	Tan	March, 1969	
36. Three Kings Night	Tan	December, 1968	

APPENDIX B

Categories for Organizing Interpersonal Interactions

1. To show affection for	1.1 behaves affectionately to	___
	1.2 speaks affectionately to	___
	1.3 shows appreciation of	___
	1.4 is friendly to	___
	1.5 feel affection for	___
	Total 1	___
2. To show interest in	2.1 pays attention to	___
	2.2 is responsive to	___
	2.3 encourages	___
	2.4 courts	___
	Total 2	___
3. To deflate	3.1 ridicules (makes fun of, mocks)	___
	3.2 is sarcastic to	___
	3.3 is disdainful to	___
	3.4 criticizes	___
	3.5 considers nonsignificant	___
	3.6 accuses of low moral standards	___
	Total 3	___
4. To influence	4.1 makes suggestion to	___
	4.2 gives advice to	___
	4.3 requests	___
	4.4 gives instructions, directions	___
	Total 4	___
5. To hurt	5.1 behaves aggressively to	___
	5.2 is cold (hostile or brusque) to	___
	5.3 speaks angrily to	___
	Total 5	___

	2	
6. To communicate with	6.1 confides in	___
	6.2 confesses to	___
	6.3 gives opinion to	___
	6.4 expresses feeling to	___
	6.5 chatters to	___
	Total 6	___
7. To educate, enlighten, inform	7.1 teaches	___
	7.2 gives information or explanation to	___
	7.3 tries to bring up successfully	___
	7.4 stimulates the interest of	___
	Total 7	___
8. To control	8.1 urges (pleads with)	___
	8.2 commands (gives orders to)	___
	8.3 dominates	___
	8.4 persuades	___
	Total 8	___
9. To conform to	9.1 is influenced by	___
	9.2 takes the advice, suggestion of	___
	9.3 obeys command or request of	___
	9.4 submits to (gives in to, is dominated by)	___
	Total 9	___
10. To obtain something from	10.1 asks for favor from	___
	10.2 asks for permission from	___
	10.3 asks for information, explanation from	___
	10.4 asks for help, pleads for	___
	Total 10	___

11. To please	11.1 gives presents to	___
	11.2 entertains	___
	11.3 promises things to	___
	Total 11	___
12. To build other up	12.1 compliments, flatters	___
	12.2 praises, rewards	___
	12.3 gives approval to	___
	12.4 reassures	___
	Total 12	___
13. Not to be understanding to	13.1 is unaccepting of	___
	13.2 is not forgiving, sympathetic to	___
	13.3 accuses, confronts	___
	13.4 doubts, acts suspicious to	___
	13.5 does not empathize	___
	13.6 is impatient	___
	Total 13	___
14. To take care of	14.1 does things for, serves	___
	14.2 protects	___
	14.3 waits on	___
	14.4 serves food or drinks	___
	14.5 buys clothing	___
	Total 14	___
15. to maintain relationship with	15.1 does things with (goes places with	___
	15.2 plays with	___
	15.3 socializes with	___
	15.4 gets along with	___
	15.5 gives invitation to (or accepts)	___
	Total 15	___

16. Not to conform to	16.1 rebels against, is insolent, defiant to	___
	16.2 protests to, contradicts	___
	16.3 does not take advice, suggestion of	___
	16.4 refuses to obey command or request of	___
	16.5 is not dominated by	___
	16.6 is not threatened by	___
	Total 16	___
17. To be understanding to	17.1 is patient with	___
	17.2 is accepting of	___
	17.3 is forgiving to	___
	17.4 is sympathetic to	___
	Total 17	___
18. To be indifferent to	18.1 ignores	___
	18.2 is unresponsive to	___
	18.3 discourages	___
	18.4 is reserved toward	___
	Total 18	___
19. To be dependent on	19.1 seeks protection, reassurance, comfort, affection from	___
	19.2 expects others to do things for	___
	19.3 asks for help, direction, advice from	___
	19.4 waits for, follows, stands beside	___
	Total 19	___
20. To discipline	20.1 punishes	___
	20.2 scolds, reprimands, admonishes	___
	20.3 is strict with	___
	Total 20	___

21. To treat with respect	21.1 is polite to	___
	21.2 takes seriously	___
	Total 21	___
22. To deceive	22.1 hides feelings from	___
	22.2 deceives, lies to	___
	22.3 does not confide in	___
	22.4 is evasive to	___
	Total 22	___
23. To help	23.1 gives support to	___
	23.2 defends	___
	23.3 helps with	___
	23.4 saves from danger	___
	Total 23	___
24. To show concern for	24.1 is solicitous of	___
	24.2 is considerate of	___
	24.3 is thoughtful of	___
	24.4 feels compassion for	___
	24.5 to worry about (positive sense)	___
	Total 24	___
25. To treat with disrespect	25.1 is rude to	___
	25.2 insults	___
	25.3 swears at	___
	Total 25	___
26. To upset	26.1 shocks	___
	26.2 frightens	___
	26.3 threatens, bullies	___
	26.4 does not comfort	___
	26.5 embarasses	___
	26.6 humiliates	___
	Total 26	___

27. To establish relationship with	27.1 initiates conversation with	___
	27.2 greets	___
	27.3 proposes marriage (accepts)	___
	27.4 goes stead with	___
	Total 27	___
28. To improve relationship with	28.1 makes up with	___
	28.2 tries to reason with	___
	28.3 asks forgiveness of (apologizes to)	___
	Total 28	___
29. To dispute with	29.1 argues with	___
	29.2 fights with	___
	29.3 disagrees with	___
	Total 29	___
30. To keep in touch with	30.1 writes to	___
	30.2 phones	___
	30.3 visits	___
	Total 30	___
31. To be independent of	31.1 refuses help, present, comfort, affection from	___
	31.2 does not seek advice of	___
	Total 31	___
32. To relate well to	32.1 kids with	___
	32.2 teases (playfully)	___
	Total 32	___
33. To calm down	33.1 reassures	___
	33.2 comforts	___
	33.3 consoles	___
	Total 33	___

34. Not to improve relationship with	34.1 does not try to make up with	___
	34.2 is defensive to (makes excuses)	___
	34.3 does not apologize to	___
	Total 34	___
35. Not to relate well to	35.1 has superficial contact with	___
	35.2 has fun at the expense of R	___
	35.3 teases in a coarse manner	___
	35.4 has noncommittal relationship	___
	Total 35	___
36. To approach	36.1 calls to	___
	36.2 approaches	___
	Total 36	___
37. To avoid	37.1 withdraws from	___
	37.2 avoids	___
	Total 37	___
38. To impress	38.1 boasts to	___
	38.2 boasts of material possession	___
	Total 38	___
39. To avoid unpleasantness with	39.1 agrees with	___
	39.2 refuses to argue with	___
	39.3 avoid discussing racial differences	___
	Total 39	___

40. To terminate relationship with	40.1 gets rid of, dismiss	___
	40.2 abandons	___
	40.3 divorces	___
	40.4 quits employment of	___
	40.5 quits dating	___
	Total 40	___
41. To compete with	41.1 competes with	___
	41.2 acts superior to	___
	41.3 takes advantage of	___
	Total 41	___
42. To feel inferior	42.1 is self-effacing to	___
	42.2 feels inadequate with respect to	___
	42.3 is embarassed	___
	Total 42	___
43. To displease	43.1 annoys, irritates	___
	43.2 frustrates	___
	43.3 denies things to	___
	Total 43	___
44. To relate equally to	44.1 cooperates with	___
	44.2 does business with	___
	44.3 accepts as equal	___
	44.4 asserts equality	___
	Total 44	___
45. To be permissive with	45.1 is permissive, lenient to	___
	45.2 does not punish for wrongdoing	___
	45.3 gives permission to	___
	Total 45	___

46. To show lack of concern for	46.1 is thoughtless of	___
	46.2 is inconsiderate of	___
	46.3 is selfish toward	___
	46.4 has resentment for	___
	Total 46	___
47. To distantiate	47.1 does things without, excludes	___
	47.2 does not socialize with, refuse invitation from	___
	47.3 does not get along with	___
	Total 47	___
48. To be like other	48.1 imitates	___
	48.2 identifies with	___
	Total 48	___
49. To neglect	49.1 neglects	___
	49.2 refuses to care for	___
	49.3 spends little time with	___
	Total 49	___
50. Not to help	50.1 gives no support to	___
	50.2 does not defend	___
	Total 50	___
51. Not to teach	51.1 does not teach	___
	51.2 does not try to bring up successfully	___
	Total 51	___
52. To lose contact with	52.1 refuses to write to	___
	52.2 does not get in touch with	___
	52.3 does not phone, visit	___
	Total 52	___

53. To be different from	53.1 does not identify with	____
	53.2 does not recognize (familiarity)	____
	53.3 considers oneself superior to R	____
	Total 53	____
54. Tries not to influence	54.1 is objective to	____
	Total 54	____
55. Tries to make independent	55.1 lets make own decisions	____
	Total 55	____
56. Does not try to get something from	56.1 does not ask for information from	____
	Total 56	____
57. To inflict injuries	57.1 beats with an instrument	____
	57.2 causes physical injury to	____
	57.3 tortures	____
	57.4 kills	____
	Total 57	____
58. To restrict physically	58.1 handcuff	____
	58.2 hold physicially	____
	58.3 arrest	____
	Total 58	____
59. Not to show affection	59.1 is unfriendly to	____
	59.2 feels bitterly toward	____
	59.3 hates	____
	59.4 does not like	____
	Total 59	____

60. Pursues member of opposite sex	60.1 false flattery	___
	60.2 seeks to possess	___
	60.3 makes advances	___
	60.4 commands to submit sexually	___
	60.5 assaults	___
	Total 60	___
61. Feels aggressive toward	61.1 is angry at	___
	61.2 would like to hurt	___
	61.3 plans to kill	___
	61.4 suppresses	___
	61.5 wants to argue with	___
	Total 61	___
62. Accepts as employee	62.1 hires	___
	62.2 retains as employee	___
	Total 62	___
63. Sharing	63.1 share interests	___
	63.2 exchange ideas	___
	63.3 exchange things	___
	63.4 shares affection for same object	___
	63.5 share concerns, problems	___
	Total 63	___
64. Feels envy for	64.1 envies opportunity	___
	64.2 envies social achievement	___
	64.3 seeks failure of recipient	___
	64.4 envies affection	___
	64.5 envies economic achievement	___
	Total 64	___

65. Not to hurt	65.1 not wanting to hurt	___
	Total 65	___
66. To feel apologetic	66.1 feel guilty	___
	66.2 to feel need to explain	___
	66.3 to apologize	___
	66.4 to regret	___
	Total 66	___
67. To express gratitude	67.1 to say thank you	___
	67.2 to speak of appreciation for	___
	67.3 to wish to thank you	___
	Total 67	___
68. To accuse of discriminatory behavior	68.1 lack of compassion	___
	68.2 job discrimination	___
	68.3 physical repulsion	___
	68.4 segregation of recreation facilities	___
	68.5 loan facilities discrimination	___
	68.6 patronizing discrimination	___
	68.7 denying facilities	___
	68.8 overall discrimination	___
	Total 68	___
69. To lower one's self	69.1 gives response expected by R	___
	69.2 proves ability to pay before requesting service	___
	69.3 feigning ignorance	___
	69.4 does thing one does not consider self-respecting	___
	69.5 submits sexually without feeling responsive	___
	Total 69	___

70. To possess persecution complex	70.1 to see others finding fault with A	____
	70.2 to see others as accusing A	____
	70.3 to see others as setting traps	____
	70.4 to see others as ridiculing A	____
	70.5 to see others as pretending to be affectionate	____
	70.6 sees R as taking advantage of A	____
	70.7 to see others as not giving just compensation	____
	70.8 to see R as suppressing him	____
	Total 70	____
71. To find fault with	71.1 considers phony	____
	71.2 considers cowardly	____
	71.3 considers educationally backward	____
	71.4 sees R as hypocrit	____
	71.5 to perceive as physically repulsive	____
	71.6 to see as burden	____
	71.7 to find amusing (negative)	____
	71.8 to view as awkward, unappealing	____
	Total 71	____
72. To admire	72.1 to admire possessions	____
	72.2 to admire status	____
	72.3 to admire human qualities	____
	72.4 to admire appearance	____
	62.5 to admire talent	____
	Total 72	____

73. Not to become upset	73.1 to keep cool in face of provocation	___
	73.2 keeps cool in face of disappointment	___
	Total 73	___
74. To be upset	74.1 to be frightened of	___
	74.2 to be embarassed	___
	74.3 to be uncomfortable	___
	74.4 is shocked by	
	74.5 feels threatened by	___
	74.6 feels humiliated by	___
	74.7 is disappointed by	___
	74.8 feels defeated	___
	Total 74	___
75. Gives inadequate service	75.1 gives slow service	___
	75.2 cheats	___
	Total 75	___
76. Denies status	76.1 denies educational status	___
	76.2 denies economic status	___
	76.3 denies professional status	___
	76.4 denies administrative status	___
	76.5 denies social status	___
	Total 76	___
77. To prevent from entering or maintaining a relationship with person of opposite sex	77.1 to disapprove	___
	77.2 to advise against	___
	77.3 to physically prevent	___
	Total 77	___

78.1 Gives adequate service to	78.1 does extra work for	___
	78.2 is proud of own performance for	___
	Total 78	___
79. To be patronizing	79.1 financial generosity	___
	79.2 provides medical care	___
	79.3 provides education	___
	79.4 provides employment	___
	79.5 social acceptance	___
	79.6 patronizing empathy	___
	Total 79	___
80. To commit theft	80.1 small theft of usable item (needed)	___
	80.2 theft of money	___
	80.3 major theft	___
	Total 80	___
81. To express dissatisfaction	81.1 complains	___
	81.2 states grievance	___
	81.3 disapprove	___
	Total 81	___
82. Expects subordination	82.1 expects social subordination	___
	82.2 expects administrative subordination	___
	82.3 expects educational subservience	___
	Total 82	___
83. Approves and admires subordination	83.1 admires social subordination	___
	83.2 admires political subordination	___
	Total 83	___

84. To defend oneself	84.1 to claim innocence	____
	84.2 to physically fight off	____
	84.3 to protect oneself with being reserve	____
	Total 84	____
85. Has trust in	85.1 trusts one's willingness to help	____
	Total 85	____
86. Sadistic pleasure in hurting	86.1 injuring	____
	86.2 beating	____
	86.3 killing for revenge	____
	86.4 teasing maliciously	____
	Total 86	____
87. Demands equality	87.1 demands equality in eating facilities	____
	87.2 demands equality	____
	Total 87	
88. To discriminate	88.1 social discrimination	____
	88.2 talent recognition	____
	88.3 public facilities	____
	88.4 denial of police protection	____
	Total 88	____
89. To destroy	89.1 seeks collective destruction	____
	89.2 takes physical action for collective destruction	____
	Total 89	____
90. To flee	90.1 runs from	____
	90.2 hides from	____
	Total 90	____

91. To lure into loose behavior	91.1 offer drinks to minor	___
	91.2 speaks lewdly to	___
	91.3 attempt to persuade to promiscuity	___
	Total 91	___
92. Refuses to be lured into loose behavior	92.1 refuses drinks	___
	92.2 refuses sex advances	___
	Total 92	___
93. To feel superior	93.1 is vain in regard to personal relationship	___
	Total 93	___
94. To expect adequate service	94.1 to expect good service	___
	Total 94	___
95. Not to trust	95.1 to doubt	___
	95.2 to have suspicions about	___
	95.3 not to believe	___
	Total 95	___
96. Prevent from moving into neighborhood	96.1 disapprove	___
	96.2 advise against	___
	96.3 to physically prevent	___
	Total 96	___

APPENDIX C

Distribution of Interactions by Interpersonal Verb Categories for Each Role Pair

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	1. Male-Female		11. Female-Male	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	1	3	5	2
2. To Show Affection For	3	4	3	4
3. To Show Concern For	4	2	8	1
4. To Cooperate	0	1	1	0
5. To Please/Support	0	3	3	1
6. To Influence/Control	0	9	1	1
7. To Assert Superiority	0	0	1	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	13	10	9	12
9. To Discriminate	1	21	23	5
10. To Distantiate	0	23	22	3
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	6	20	4
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	2	9	28	4
13. Not To Conform	0	0	3	2
14. To be Discontented	0	0	0	1
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	2	2	2	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	5	3
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	12	31	1	2
	38	124	135	45

APPENDIX C
2

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	2. Employer-Employee		12. Employee-Employer	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	1	4	0
2. To Show Affection For	0	3	0	0
3. To Show Concern For	0	3	2	0
4. To Cooperate	0	0	0	0
5. To Please/Support	0	3	1	1
6. To Influence/Control	0	1	1	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	3	1	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	12	4	0
9. To Discriminate	0	4	6	0
10. To Distantiate	0	7	4	0
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	5	3	0
12. To Feel Inadequare and Persecuted	0	5	10	0
13. Not To Conform	0	1	7	0
14. To be Discontented	0	0	0	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	3	5	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	7	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	0	2	2	0
	0	56	57	1

APPENDIX C
3

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	3. Helping Profession-Beneficiary		13. Beneficiary-Helping Profession	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	0	4	2
2. To Show Affection For	0	1	1	0
3. To Show Concern For	0	0	19	8
4. To Cooperate	0	0	0	0
5. To Please/Support	0	3	0	6
6. To Influence/Control	0	2	2	3
7. To Assert Superiority	0 0	1	0	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	16	5	3
9. To Discriminate	0	27	4	1
10. To Distantiate	1	2	7	3
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	3	17	4
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	1	5	12	2
13. Not To Conform	0	0	3	0
14. To Be Discontented	0	0	0	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	1	1	6	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	0	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	0	11	0	0
	3	72	80	32

APPENDIX C
4

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	4. Police Official-Citizen		14. Citizen-Police Official	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	0	1	0
2. To Show Affection For	0	0	1	0
3. To Show Concern For	0	0	0	0
4. To Cooperate	0	0	0	0
5. To Please/Support	0	0	0	0
6. To Influence/Control	0	4	1	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	0	0	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	37	1	3
9. To Discriminate	0	34	6	4
10. To Distantiate	0	7	0	0
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	0	1	0
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	0	2	7	1
13. Not To Conform	0	1	12	1
14. To Be Discontented	0	9	2	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	0	4	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	1	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	0	0	1	0
	0	94	38	9

APPENDIX C
5

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	5. Public Official-Citizen		15. Citizen-Public Official	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	0	1	0
2. To Show Affection For	0	0	0	0
3. To Show Concern For	0	0	0	0
4. To Cooperate	0	0	0	0
5. To Please/Support	0	0	0	0
6. To Influence/Control	0	0	1	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	0	1	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	0	2	0
9. To Discriminate	0	0	0	0
10. To Distantiate	0	1	0	0
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	2	0	0
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	0	0	1	0
13. Not To Conform	0	0	2	0
14. To Be Discontented	0	0	0	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	0	0	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	1	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	0	3	0	0
	0	6	9	0

APPENDIX C
6

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	6. Teacher-Student		16. Student-Teacher	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	3	0	2
2. To Show Affection For	1	1	0	0
3. To Show Concern For	2	8	1	3
4. To Cooperate	1	1	0	1
5. To Please/Support	0	5	1	3
6. To Influence/Control	0	1	0	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	0	0	1
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	3	1	0
9. To Discriminate	0	0	0	1
10. To Distantiate	0	2	0	0
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	2	3	0
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	0	6	3	0
13. Not To Conform	0	0	1	0
14. To Be Discontented	0	1	0	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	0	1	0
16. To Defend Oneself	1	0	0	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	2	4	0	0
	7	37	11	11

APPENDIX C
7

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair	
7. Male-Male		
	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	3	4
2. To Show Affection For	4	10
3. To Show Concern For	2	3
4. To Cooperate	1	1
5. To Please/Support	1	10
6. To Influence/Control	6	2
7. To Assert Superiority	0	2
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	13	18
9. To Discriminate	14	45
10. To Distantiate	11	5
11. To Behave Subordinately	12	0
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	11	18
13. Not To Conform	10	4
14. To Be Discontented	0	1
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	7	0
16. To Defend Oneself	2	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	1	6
	98	129

APPENDIX C
8

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair	
8. Female-Female		
	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	2	3
2. To Show Affection For	2	0
3. To Show Concern For	3	1
4. To Cooperate	0	1
5. To Please/Support	1	0
6. To Influence/Control	0	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	1
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	6	1
9. To Discriminate	1	4
10. To Distantiate	4	1
11. To Behave Subordinately	2	1
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	3	3
13. Not To Conform	0	1
14. To Be Discontented	3	1
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	1	1
	28	19

APPENDIX D

Instructions for Rating Interpersonal Verbs on Semantic Features

In everyday life, we use interpersonal verbs to describe the behavior of people toward each other. These interpersonal verbs have certain features which carry implications about the intentions of the Actor (A) toward the object (B). In our research so far, we have isolated a number of features which appear to characterize interpersonal verbs. A brief description of each of these features is in the attached sheets. In the present task, we want to see if you are able to use these features discriminately. Your judgments are to be based on what you know about people in general. They are not to be based on your own personal behavior. Neither are they to be based on how you think people ought to behave. You are simply to report, as objectively as possible, what you have learned about the nature of people's intentions toward one another.

On the pages which follow you will be presented with a set of interpersonal verbs, each followed by a series of 10 scales representing the hypothesized semantic features. Putting yourself in the role of the Actor, e.g., in the sentence "A helps B," you are to describe the nature of the intention to help by checking appropriate locations along the seven-step scales. In general, the scale positions have the following meanings.

X	:	:	:	:	:	:	Y
extremely X	quite X	slightly X	neither or equally	slightly Y	quite Y	extremely Y	

Now we give definitions of the 10 features as we have used them ourselves along with our own differentiation of the intention to help as a general illustration. Of course, you may disagree with some of our judgments, but that is your privilege as an independent native speaker of English.

I. DELIBERATE vs. IMPULSIVE feature: If the intent of person A is calculated, planned and voluntary with respect to behaving toward person B, it is to some degree Deliberate; if it is uncalculated, unplanned and involuntary, then it is to some degree Impulsive. (EXAMPLES: guide/inspire, assist/pay homage to, borrow from/beg.)

to help

Deliberate	:	:	:	X	:	:	:	Impulsive

II. MORAL vs. IMMORAL feature: If the intent of person A toward person B would be judged ethical by an impartial observer, then it is to some degree Moral; if it would be judged unethical by an impartial observer, then it is to some degree Immoral. (EXAMPLES: exalt/humiliate, reason with/dictate to, protect/deceive.)

to help

Moral____:____: X :____:____:____:____Immoral

III. SUPRAORDINATE vs. SUBORDINATE feature: If the intent of person A is to express superior status with respect to person B, then it is to some degree Supraordinate; if it is to express inferior status with respect to person B, it is to some degree Subordinate. (EXAMPLES: protect/assist, demand/comply, lead/follow.)

to help

Supraordinate____:____: X :____:____:____:____Subordinate

IV. FUTURE vs. PAST ORIENTATION feature: If the intent of person A with respect to person B is concerned with some future condition or event, it is to some degree Future Oriented; if it is concerned with some past condition or event, it is to some degree Past Oriented. (EXAMPLES: pledge/apologize, persuade/remind, enlist the support of/reciprocate.)

to help

Future Oriented____: X :____:____:____:____:____ Past Oriented

V. POTENT vs. IMPOTENT feature: If the intent of person A toward person B implies large amounts of energy or effort or potential energy or effort on the part of A, then it is to some degree Potent; if it implies small amounts of energy or effort on A's part, it is to some degree Impotent. (EXAMPLES: support/apologize, punish/rebuke, challenge/question.)

to help

Potent____:____:____:____: X :____:____Impotent

VI. INITIATING vs. REACTING feature. If the intent of person A is to elicit some response from person B, then it is to some degree Initiating; if it is to respond to some prior behavior of B, then it is to some degree Reacting. (EXAMPLES: cheer up/congratulate, persuade/disuade, provoke/frustrate.)

to help

Initiating____:____:____:____:____: X :____Reacting

VII. ASSOCIATIVE vs. DISSOCIATIVE feature: If the intent of person A is to decrease tension with respect to B, then it is to some degree Associative; if it is to increase tension with respect to B, it is to some degree Dissociative. (EXAMPLES: support/blame, invite/reject, compliment/insult.)

to help

Associative X :____:____:____:____:____:____Dissociative

VIII. TERMINAL vs. INTERMINAL feature. If the intention of person A with respect to person B has a clear-cut beginning or ending in time and is reasonably brief, then it is Terminal; if it has no clear-cut beginning or ending in time and is reasonably prolonged, it is Interminal. (EXAMPLES: unite with/associate with, praise/admire, inform/supervise.)

to help

Terminal____:____:____: X :____:____:____Interminal

IX. EGO vs. ALTER-ORIENTED feature. If the intent of person A is to change his own state of affairs via his behavior toward person B, then it is Ego-oriented; if it is to change B's state of affairs vis his behavior toward B, then it is Alter-oriented. (EXAMPLES: enlist support of/cheer up, impress/inform, exploit/corrupt.)

to help

Ego-oriented____:____:____:____:____:____: X Alter-oriented

X. ACTIVE vs. PASSIVE feature: If the intent of person A toward person B implies a high rate or variety of actions on the part of A, then it is Active; if it implies a low rate or variety of actions on the part of A, then it is Passive. (EXAMPLES: retaliate/resist, manipulate/profit from, take care of/be responsible for.)

to help

Active____:____:_X_:____:____:____:____Passive

You may wish to refer back to these definitions and examples as you proceed with the task.

APPENDIX D
5

A Seeks Approval of B

Deliberate	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Impulsive
Moral	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Immoral
Supraordinate	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Subordinate
Future Oriented	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Past Oriented
Potent	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Impotent
Initiating	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Reacting
Associative	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Dissociative
Terminal	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Interminal
Ego-oriented	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Alter-oriented
Active	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7	Passive

APPENDIX E

Mean Ratings on Semantic Features for Black-to-White and White-to-Black Interaction for Various Role Pair Categories

Features	Role Pair			
	1. Male-Female		11. Female-Male	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	2.42	1.83	2.14	2.17
2. Potent/Impotent	2.07	1.83	1.80	2.02
3. Active/Passive	2.68	2.60	2.00	2.51
4. Associative/Dissociative	2.47	1.75	1.77	2.11
5. Initiating/Reacting	2.44	2.12	1.36	1.84
6. Ego-oriented/ alter/oriented	1.47	1.85	2.28	1.80
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	2.13	2.29	1.81	2.00
8. Terminal/Interminal	1.68	2.01	1.79	1.68
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	2.02	2.14	1.80	1.77
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.15	2.48	1.91	1.91
N =	38	124	135	45

APPENDIX E
2

Features	Role Pair			
	2. Employer-Employee		12. Employee-Employer	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	0	2.07	1.98	3.0
2. Potent/Impotent	0	2.03	2.01	2.0
3. Active/Passive	0	2.57	2.21	3.0
4. Associative/Dissociative	0	2.00	1.77	3.0
5. Initiating/Reacting	0	2.09	1.52	1.0
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	0	1.48	1.92	1.0
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	0	2.40	1.92	2.0
8. Terminal/Interminal	0	2.18	1.70	3.0
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	0	2.00	1.75	1.0
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	0	2.38	1.96	3.0
N =		56	57	1

APPENDIX E
3

Features	Role Pair			
	3. Helping Profession-Beneficiary		13. Beneficiary-Helping Profession	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	2.33	1.54	2.35	2.56
2. Potent/Impotent	1.33	2.22	1.77	2.09
3. Active/Passive	1.66	2.83	2.18	2.68
4. Associative/Dissociative	1.33	1.68	2.25	2.43
5. Initiating/Reacting	1.33	2.18	1.57	2.50
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	2.33	1.38	1.97	1.50
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	1.66	2.55	1.71	2.00
8. Terminal/Interminal	1.00	2.33	1.72	2.03
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	1.33	1.83	1.90	2.12
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.33	2.04	2.01	2.37
N =	3	72	80	32

APPENDIX E
4

Features	Role Pair			
	4. Police Official-Citizen		14. Citizen-Police Official	
	B-W	W-B	B=W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	0	1.12	1.83	1.55
2. Potent/Impotent	0	2.47	2.05	2.22
3. Active/Passive	0	2.68	2.37	2.00
4. Associative/Dissociative	0	1.06	1.45	1.33
5. Initiating/Reacting	0	2.19	1.40	1.88
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	0	1.25	2.43	1.77
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	0	2.89	1.86	2.77
8. Terminal/Interminal	0	1.96	1.43	1.44
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	0	1.75	1.35	2.11
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	0	2.21	2.00	2.33
N =		94	38	9

APPENDIX E
5

Features	Role Pair			
	5. Public Official-Citizen		15. Citizen-Public Official	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	0	2.50	1.88	0
2. Potent/Impotent	0	1.50	2.22	0
3. Active/Passive	0	1.33	2.33	0
4. Associative/Dissociative	0	2.66	1.77	0
5. Initiating/Reacting	0	1.00	1.55	0
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter/oriented	0	1.16	2.11	0
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	0	2.16	2.33	0
8. Terminal/Interminal	0	1.33	1.66	0
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	0	1.66	1.88	0
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	0	3.00	2.22	0
N =		6	9	

APPENDIX E
6

Features	Role Pair			
	6. Teacher-Student		16. Student-Teacher	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	2.71	2.35	2.27	2.45
2. Potent/Impotent	2.14	1.83	1.72	2.18
3. Active/Passive	3.00	2.10	2.00	2.00
4. Associative/Dissociative	2.71	2.24	2.27	2.63
5. Initiating/Reacting	2.28	1.62	1.90	1.18
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.28	1.72	2.45	1.54
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	2.14	2.08	1.72	2.09
8. Terminal/Interminal	2.14	1.83	2.00	1.36
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	2.14	1.67	1.72	1.81
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.57	2.00	2.45	1.45
N =	7	37	11	11

APPENDIX E
7

Features	Role Pair	
	7. Male-Male	
	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	1.83	1.47
2. Potent/Impotent	1.98	2.31
3. Active/Passive	2.24	2.47
4. Associative/Dissociative	1.62	1.81
5. Initiating/Reacting	1.54	1.71
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.44	1.58
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	1.94	2.52
8. Terminal/Interminal	1.69	1.91
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	1.70	1.89
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.14	1.90
N =	98	129

APPENDIX E
8

Features	Role Pair	
	8. Female-Female	
	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	1.92	1.78
2. Potent/Impotent	1.96	2.10
3. Active/Passive	2.10	2.36
4. Associative/Dissociative	1.92	1.73
5. Initiating/Reacting	1.46	1.31
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.64	1.84
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	2.03	2.26
8. Terminal/Interminal	1.82	1.84
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	1.53	1.67
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.07	2.00
N =	28	19

APPENDIX F

Three-Way Frequency Tables Showing Role Dimension Distribution on Ten Semantic Features

MORAL/IMMORAL

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.70	1.96	2.00	1.96	2.25	1.60	2.38	1.66
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	2.75	2.00	2.01	1.90	1.83	1.78	1.98	1.86
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	2.09	1.87	1.98	1.72	2.15	1.57	2.12	1.66
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	2.44	1.94	2.00	1.88	2.08	1.65		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

POTENT/IMPOTENT

High	2.10	1.93	2.10	1.86	1.50	2.13	1.98	2.09
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	1.75	1.66	1.94	2.11	1.93	2.21	1.94	2.13
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.90	2.42	1.90	2.21	1.84	2.35	1.85	2.29
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.92	2.02	1.93	2.11	1.86	2.18		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

APPENDIX F
2

ACTIVE/PASSIVE

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	3.00	2.03	2.15	2.07	1.75	2.65	2.47	2.54
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	3.00	3.00	2.21	2.44	2.20	2.71	2.21	2.52
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.90	2.42	2.05	2.66	2.18	2.48	2.14	2.55
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=171
Mean	2.52	2.17	2.19	2.44	2.17	2.65		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

ASSOCIATIVE/DISSOCIATIVE

High	2.60	2.06	1.95	2.07	1.25	1.56	2.12	1.64
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	3.00	3.00	1.84	1.91	1.72	1.74	1.84	1.87
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.54	1.87	1.76	1.61	1.88	1.25	1.84	1.47
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	2.20	2.09	1.83	1.88	1.83	1.59		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

APPENDIX F
3

INITIATING/REACTING

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.20	1.62	1.68	1.69	1.25	2.22	1.84	2.12
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	2.75	2.66	1.64	1.75	1.50	2.22	1.64	1.89
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.27	1.42	1.37	1.45	1.40	1.48	1.45	1.46
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.88	1.66	1.61	1.71	1.41	2.15		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

EGO-ORIENTED/ALTER-ORIENTED

High	1.20	1.72	1.96	1.31	2.50	1.52	1.70	1.58
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	1.00	1.00	1.92	1.69	2.44	1.32	1.92	1.58
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	2.45	1.71	1.75	1.58	2.15	1.67	2.11	1.63
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.72	1.66	1.90	1.66	2.13	1.47		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

APPENDIX F
4

SUPRAORDINATE/SUBORDINATE

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.10	2.17	2.00	2.08	1.25	2.56	1.90	2.48
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	1.75	1.66	1.97	2.35	1.97	2.49	1.97	2.38
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.72	2.14	1.83	2.35	1.72	2.45	1.73	2.37
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.88	2.12	1.95	2.33	1.77	2.53		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

TERMINAL/INTERMINAL

High	2.20	1.68	1.66	1.77	1.00	2.14	1.79	2.06
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=24	N=245
Neutral	1.25	1.33	1.73	1.83	1.77	2.15	1.47	1.63
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.45	1.85	1.56	1.97	1.71	2.19	1.67	2.05
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.72	1.69	1.70	1.84	1.71	2.15		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

APPENDIX F
5

FUTURE-ORIENTED/PAST-ORIENTED

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.20	1.62	2.25	1.62	1.50	1.95	2.08	1.84
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	2.00	2.00	1.85	1.85	1.75	1.86	1.83	1.86
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.18	1.71	1.60	1.76	1.66	2.06	1.62	1.88
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.72	1.66	1.83	1.83	1.68	1.95		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

DELIBERATE/IMPULSIVE

High	2.60	1.75	2.20	2.61	2.00	2.40	2.35	2.33
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	2.00	2.00	2.10	2.07	2.14	2.10	2.07	1.54
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.90	1.57	1.87	1.82	1.93	1.87	1.92	1.81
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	2.20	1.74	2.07	2.06	1.98	2.26		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		